State of New Jersey
RFP for PAMS
Addendum #2

1. Functional Requirement 121 on the CAMA tab states there is a need to support uploads of sketches from different packages.
   a. Please define which packages other than those provided by the Vendor you would propose using?
   b. Further, is there an initial need to convert sketches into the supplied tools from more than one source?

   Answer: This requirement is intended to indicate that there will be the need to convert/upload sketches from existing packages in the three (3) initial implementation counties into the CAMA package of the chosen vendor. Therefore Part "a" of the question is not relevant. For Part "b", the answer is "yes"; most municipalities using a sketch package in the three initial counties use one of two proprietary sketch packages that, to the best of the State's knowledge, utilize vector commands. These packages were written by either Vital Computer Resources or Micro-Systems, two of the current MOD IV vendors.

2. In Section 1, "Purpose and Intent", on page 35, the following statement is made, "PAMS is intended as a centralized, web-based (thin client) J2EE or .NET system owned and operated by the State that replaces MOD IV and its peripheral systems currently provided by various private firms across the State." Does the State have a clear preference between the two?

   Answer: #1: The State does not have a preference for one technology over another. OIT can support either a J2EE or .NET solution for PAMS. The bidder should bid the solution that it feels best meets the requirements of the RFP while also minimizing the cost to the State.

3. Is the Bid Number the same as the previous RFP (03-X-35979)?

   Answer: The bid number identified above is from the first iteration of the PAMS RFP. The current PAMS RFP does not have a unique numeric identifier. The waiver that results from this process will have a unique identifier assigned to it by the State.

4. RFP page 1, (iv), "Each bidder…RFP by 4PM on December 15, 2004." In order for the State to avoid the elimination of qualified small businesses from bidding the PAMS project, it is requested that a two (2) week extension of the proposal due date be granted. Small businesses typically are not required to provide "performance" bonds and certainly in the amounts required for this project. Additional time will in almost every case be required to complete the establishment of a performance bonding line and the two (2) week extension would most likely allow adequate time to complete this financial effort.

   Answer: The State recognizes the effort involved in planning and preparing a comprehensive proposal, however, it is essential the State move expeditiously towards awarding a contract, so work on the project can begin. The due date remains December 15, 2004 (4PM).

5. RFP page 48, Section 3.2.3, "Analysis and Design". This section states that UML diagrams are required. Can the State identify the specific UML diagrams that are required for the deliverable, i.e., Sequence Diagrams, Use Case Diagrams, Activity Diagrams, etc.

   Answer: The State requires that such UML diagrams as are necessary to thoroughly define, describe and document the PAMS system design be provided as a deliverable of this project phase. Diagram types should include Structure types (Class, Object, Component, etc.), as well as Behavior types (Activity, Use Case, etc.).

6.   RFP page 61 through 64, Section 3.3, "Functional Requirements". This section of the RFP describes the functional requirements in very general and non-specific terms. It is our understanding of the RFP that the detailed and specific functional requirements are stated in Exhibit G and the software requirements and design that will be produced under this RFP will come from these specific functional requirements stated in Exhibit G. Are we correct in assuming that if we develop a software requirements and design that meets all the specific functional requirements listed in Exhibit G, then we have also implicitly met all the generalized requirements stated in section 3.3?

Answer: Yes.

7.   RFP page 70, Section 4.4.2.1, "Minimum Bidder Experience". Can the Minimum Bidder Experience be met by having a subcontractor on the proposed team who has the required experience or must the prime bidder **itself** have the required experience listed under section 3.1.1 on page 42?
- Designing and implementing real property assessment and tax collection systems.
- Designing and implementing web-based transaction systems.

Answer: Yes, the Minimum Bidder Experience can be met by having a subcontractor on the prime bidder's proposed team who has the required experience. The prime bidder itself does not necessarily have to have the required experience listed in section 3.1.1 of the RFP.

8.   RFP page 88, Section 5.23.1, "Payment Schedule". Can the bidder propose an alternative payment schedule or must the bidder adhere to the payment schedule defined on page 88?

Answer: Bidders must adhere to the payment schedule contained in the RFP Section 5.23.1 for purposes of submitting a proposal.

9.   RFP page 89, Section 5.25, "Replacement of Section (III)-(I)-1(d) of Standard Terms and Conditions for Waivered Services Contracts". The first paragraph of this section states that the contractor liability "shall be limited in the aggregate to **500%** of the value of the contract." Could this statement be a typographical error?

Answer: No. Section 5.25 of the PAMS RFP is correct as written.